



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WAR AND PEACE: THE MILITARY POINT OF VIEW.

BY CAPTAIN WILLIAM H. MONROE, COAST ARTILLERY CORPS, U. S. A.

IN Rousseau's words, "War is the foulest fiend ever vomited forth from the mouth of hell"; and the same outcry against war has been heard in every age of the world's history. Poets, philosophers, historians, the sacred books of the East,—all unite in condemning war. In each successive age till now, war has incurred the fiercest denunciations of the holiest, wisest and best of men; and of all men, none are more in sympathy with the public sentiment against war than military men. Eminent soldiers have testified to their abhorrence of war. Napoleon declared it the trade of barbarians. Wellington wrote to Lord Shaftesbury: "War is a most detestable thing. If you had seen but one day of war, you would pray God you might never see another." Washington said, "My first wish is to see this plague of mankind, war, banished from the earth." General Sherman wrote that he was "tired and sick of war. Its glory is all moonshine. It is only those who have neither fired a shot nor heard the shrieks and groans of the wounded, who cry aloud for more blood, more vengeance, more desolation. War is Hell."

Primitive man was a savage, endowed with cruel and ferocious instincts, but likewise with moral sensibility and gentler virtues, destined to work the miracle of civilization. Age upon age elapsed, century after century passed into antiquity, before there began to move within the human breast the mysterious influences of enlightenment and culture. The first groping of mankind towards enlightenment seems to have manifested itself in a crude and vague religious sense, with a glimmering recognition of a supreme being and the admission of authority predominating over the will. Yielding to fear, no doubt, the pagan mind sur-

rendered a portion of its primitive self-sufficiency; and stubbornly and rebelliously man was forced by the gods of pagan mythology to admit his impuissance and weakness in the presence of authority. This sanction of authority, with its origin in fetichism and superstition, is the cornerstone of the vast and magnificent structure which we call civilization.

All down the ages men have been coming more and more under the restraining influences of authority. The pages of history reek with the bloodshed of contests for supremacy. For be it known, mankind has never willingly submitted to authority. The downfall of the feudal system, the defiance of papal authority, and the denial of the divine right of kings are but successive steps in the grand march of civilization towards universal autonomy, towards the recognition of authority, when every man shall be free, recognizing clearly the freedom of other men, and the world, at last, shall be at peace. Civilization has not reached that point yet, far from it. National life to-day is a struggle, as it has always been, a contest for supremacy and maintenance of sovereignty.

It has been truly said that so long as selfishness and greed and the willingness and the brutality to do injustice continue in this world, we must have the policeman; and the international policeman whose presence makes the use of his club unnecessary is the army and the navy. But the idealist, in his impatience, turns upon the army and navy in derision and anger, like the bull when he spies the red flag at the crossing, charging madly upon the innocent symbol of danger, but deaf to the rush and the roar and the shriek of the engine. In a frenzied diatribe, entitled "The Delusion of Militarism," which appeared in "The Atlantic Monthly," March, 1909, the Rev. Charles Edward Jefferson, D.D., considers his "turbulent and war-rumor-tormented" twentieth century, and reaches the conclusion that "the world is bewildered and plagued, harassed and tormented by an awful delusion," that "the nations are in the clutches of the militarists and no way of escape has yet been discovered." A veritable Rip Van Winkle, while he rubs his eyes and is able to discern only phantoms of his own sick imagination, the world is still advancing in its struggle towards universal autonomy.

Peace will come with the universal admission of authority; and that is the ideal of civilization, but how far mankind is from

the achievement of the ideal is easily seen. Civilization, culture, polish, refinement,—all these terms have reference to a change in man, not indeed natural but exceedingly artificial and moral in its nature. Let it not be forgotten, men do not yield willingly to authority. It has been truly said that laws are capable of enforcement only so far as they are in agreement with the opinions of the community in which they are to be enforced. In other words, the force of law is the public opinion which prescribes it. The grace of civilization is like a yoke; the moral virtues are all sacrificial. Human will is stubborn and submits with difficulty to any recognition of authority; and how persistent a trait of human nature it is, we very well know. The ideal of civilization is so far from achievement that we may say: civilization is only a crust; culture, a veneer; polish and refinement, skin-deep. Human passions are constantly breaking out to consume and devastate, like the veritable fires of hell. What crimes are not committed by men in this enlightened day of the twentieth century? How quickly men lapse into barbarism when the spirit of the mob is upon them! And mob violence is not confined to brutal and unintelligent men; nor is the spirit of the anarchist restricted to the followers of red flags. Nevertheless, thin as the crust may be, civilization has transformed mankind and we pride ourselves on being less ferocious and cruel than the savages. The mind is ever bent on high ideals, and somewhere in the breast of the lowliest smoulders the spark of a moral nature, ready to burst into flames of purification and sacrifice when the proper influences are present. The struggle between good and evil is identically the struggle between the natural and the moral instincts that has been raging in the breasts of men ever since the dawn of civilization.

Peace will not come through the hot temper of the thoughtless and of the inconsiderate, of those who vainly cry from the housetops, "Peace! Peace!" yet lack in their hearts that spirit of justice upon which alone peace can be founded. The entire world yearns for peace, and except in rare instances war is not made nowadays for the mere love of war. We have passed, in the development of modern civilization, from the old days when war was a trade, when men fought for the pleasure of it. We have not achieved the ideal yet, we probably never shall; but a comparison of the present with the past reveals the wonderful

progress of civilization, and we are encouraged to see that in all the qualities of mind and heart that make for peace, the world is improving; and no one can fail to see that the tendency of human development is ever towards peace and good-fellowship among nations. But so long as private interests are ruled by selfishness and greed, and so long as public opinion tolerates contemptuous treatment of authority, and permits bad faith and worse manners in relations of an international character, wars of necessity must come. Since men have never ceased to quarrel with and misunderstand one another, private war is brought on among individuals; and since the test of a structure lies in the strength of its weakest members, it follows that national pride and sensitiveness are even more keenly alive to insult than can be so in the case of individuals.

International law,—the code of international etiquette,—something unheard of until comparatively recent times, is based solely on the sanction of authority recognized by civilized nations; and so far as war is concerned, international law cannot control it. Something stronger than law is needed; public sentiment must deal with it. It has been truly said that when public opinion has risen to such height all over the world, that the peoples of every country treat the peoples of every other country with the human kindness that binds home communities together, we shall see an end of war—and not till then. We inherit the warlike propensity; our fighting ancestors have bred pugnacity into our bone and sinew, and thousands of years of peace could not breed it out of us. Popular enthusiasm is but too easily aroused at the prospect of war. Let the daily papers rouse public opinion to a certain fighting pitch, and nothing can withstand it.

The charge is unblushingly made by the peace enthusiasts that the professional soldier encourages war, that the fountains from which flow the dark and swollen streams of war-rumor are located within the military and naval encampments. The great military leaders of the world realize the vital importance of strong military establishments as a safeguard of the national welfare. Our military leaders are expected to study the difficult problems of warfare, and the nation reposes special confidence in these chosen servants as the watchmen on duty, alert for any danger within or without the walls. Such was the nature of the recent warning of Lieutenant-General MacArthur, U. S. A., that unless we make

extensive preparations we shall be taken at a great disadvantage by an enemy one of these days, and possibly humiliated by a series of defeats before we can get in fighting trim; such was the warning given by regular officers before the War of 1812, before the Civil War and before the Spanish-American War; and such was the warning uttered by Lord Roberts, which so profoundly stirred the English nation, in revealing to them how easily England could be overrun by a German army. The greatest statesman the world has ever known, the pacific Gladstone, was the advocate of a powerful fleet, yet for nearly a century England has not had a single war in which she has asserted her naval supremacy. England's formula of naval strength has for some time been: The British navy in fighting strength must equal the next two strongest navies plus ten per cent. Now, according to the logic of those afflicted with militarophobia, England's overwhelming supremacy on the sea should be attended by endless wars with her neighbors; but history has shown the absurdity of such a conclusion. The development of England's navy has kept pace with the growth of her commerce and trade; and the present demand for Dreadnoughts comes not alone from military men, but is made by the business interests of the nation. It is the first duty of the officers of our army and navy to study the national needs of defence from the military view-point and make clear to our people how best to guard our country from invasion and properly defend it both at home and abroad. Indeed, armies and navies but represent the sentiment, temper and spirit of the people themselves; and as Colonel Church says:

"The causes that bring armies and navies into being lie so far beneath the surface, are the effects of so many currents and cross-currents of human feeling, that all the efforts of all the men of the army and navy working unremittingly together could no more affect it than the foam-churning prows of warships could deflect the onward sweep of the Gulf Stream."

It was a matter of gossip at the beginning of the Spanish-American War that the people who were charging the government with unpreparedness, who were insisting upon our navy being sent to protect them, were those living in Boston and vicinity. Certainly there was no part of our country which was in a greater state of anxiety than the New England coast, and especially in the vicinity of Boston. This incident well shows the condition of

the public mind at a time of actual danger. But, they say, in time of peace there is no enemy, there is no war. What is the use of all this preparation anyway? When war comes, the peace dreamers are the very ones who accuse the government and charge it with a lack of preparation for war.

Mr. Foss, Chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, in a forceful speech in Congress the other day, said:

“When cause for war arises, then the spirit of every American rises up immediately filled with resentment. He wants to strike. It is the natural thing, and so I say we will not have universal peace until every man is able to subdue himself. I remember at the beginning of the Spanish-American War how some of the members on this floor at that time were anxious to rush into war. I say, let us pray for it in every closet, let us preach universal peace from every housetop, let us do everything in our power to advance the cause of civilization and of Christianity among the nations of the world; but I believe that we should at the same time always make adequate defence in case we should be attacked by foreign foe. Let us maintain a navy which will defend our coasts, which will defend the Panama Canal, which will defend the rights of American citizens wherever they are, which will also back up our foreign policies, and which will defend the Philippine Islands, where we are leading great numbers of people up the steep of civilization into the clearer and higher atmosphere of manhood and of womanhood. In fact, we need a navy to-day, not the greatest navy on the face of the globe, but a navy strong enough so that in every hour of international emergency we will be able to insist upon our just demands with any nation on the face of the globe.”

Wars are of frequent occurrence to-day; and warlike Germany stands conspicuously alone as the only great nation that has not been at war during the last twelve years. The Czar of Russia, he of the peace conference; England; France; Spain; the United States; Japan,—all have been involved in war. Speaking of Japan, Gen. Francis V. Greene, in a recent address, pointed out that in the event of war with the United States, Japan would attempt to seize the Philippines. General Greene does not believe that the Japanese could transport across the Pacific an army of sufficient size to make any impression in an attack on the Pacific coast of the United States; but an eminent military authority of the English army is of the opinion that the Japanese could not only cross the Pacific, but penetrate to the Mississippi Valley before the United States could raise and equip an army of sufficient size to arrest their progress. Of the result of such

a war, General Greene thinks there could be but little doubt. He says:

"It would mean the absolute destruction of Japan. Its people have courage, skill, discipline and religious patriotism, but their resources as compared with those of the United States are so slight that success would be impossible; and in such a conflict of races the very successes which the Japanese would obtain in the beginning would lead the nation which carried the Civil War to a triumphant conclusion to carry on the contest with Japan until it reached a point where Japan would never again be in a position to disturb its tranquillity. . . . It is hard to realize what is nevertheless the fact, that the main topic of conversation among all the subordinate officers in the Philippines and among the great mass of the Japanese is the question of the probability of war between Japan and the United States or one of the nations of Europe. The higher officials pooh-pooh the idea and discountenance the discussion. The responsible statesmen of Japan, well-informed as to their own resources in comparison with those of their possible antagonists, are keenly and sincerely desirous of peace for the present at all events. But the instincts of mankind, the desire for fierce struggle for the mastery are, I believe, much the same as they have been these thousands of years; and in the Orient there is now a novel, unprecedented, difficult and uncertain situation. All the great nations of the Western World are gathered there and striving for an advantage over each other in a trade and commerce which may soon grow to enormous proportions. In the same situation there is also the nation which is at once the most populous, the most ancient and the most inert in the world; and there also is the nation which is the most ambitious, the most aggressive and the most warlike. That the solution of it all may be brought about peacefully is, of course, possible, nay, even probable. But, on the other hand, it cannot be denied that a gigantic war is also a possible outcome of the situation there."

A certain part of the press of the United States is crying aloud at the "Cost of Armed Peace," and in the discussion the United States is held up to the reproach of mankind because it spends a few millions each year in the development of a proper military establishment. If these gentlemen would put upon one side of the ledger the cost of armed peace and charge up on the other side the cost which this country has suffered in every war because of lack of preparation, they would find that it will amount to many times more than we have spent for military preparation. We Americans are too apt to indulge in self-glorification and to consider ourselves and our country as the greatest things on the earth. A little less of false patriotism and a better understanding of our limitations would have saved us many times in the past

much humiliation and much loss of life and property. It has been truly said that our great war expenses have been caused simply because we did not have sense enough to arm ourselves properly in time of peace.

In his admirable essay on "The Moral Equivalent of War," after discussing General Homer Lea's recent book, "The Valor of Ignorance," in which that officer attempts to show that Japan has entered upon a vast policy of conquest—the game in which the first moves were her wars with China and Russia and her treaty with England, and of which the final objective is the capture of the Philippines, the Hawaiian Islands, Alaska and the whole of our coast west of the Sierra passes, Professor William James admits the plausibility of General Lea's dismal forecast and concludes that,

"There is no reason to think that women can no longer be the mothers of Napoleonic or Alexandrian characters; and if these come in Japan and find their opportunity, just such surprises as 'The Valor of Ignorance' paints may lurk in ambush for us. Ignorant as we still are of the innermost recesses of Japanese mentality, we may be foolhardy to disregard such possibilities."

The military profession must not be confounded with the mercenary trade which, unfortunately, it was in ancient times, when pride, gold, women, slaves, excitement were the chief motives that led men to make war. It is no longer true that the professional soldier is primarily required for purposes of aggression; nor is the military career merely an affair of hire and salary. It is strictly true that what makes it a holy duty to defend one's home and country also makes it a holy duty not to invade the country and home of others. Military men doubtless have a keener appreciation of the truth of this axiom than those who are loudest in their denunciation of war and preparation for war. There is a type of military character which every one feels that the race should never cease to breed, for every one is wide awake to its superiority. Let us not be misunderstood, the apologist for war *per se* is hopelessly obsolescent. Military men deny neither the bestiality nor the horror nor the expense of war; and as a means of producing peace between nations, war is recognized as the most futile of all remedies. Military men are at heart peace-loving men, and they are as a class strong peace-advocates. They are thoroughly disciplined, lofty ideals are constantly before them,

and their moral training is such that duty, justice, honesty, truthfulness, unselfishness and patriotism are chief among the qualities that distinguish the profession of arms to-day. The military instincts and ideals are as strong as ever, modern man inherits all the innate pugnacity and all the love of glory of his ancestors; but men no longer play the game of war for the mere love of glory. Only when forced upon us, only when injustice leaves us no alternative, is a war now thought admissible.

Those who refuse to admit that war may be a transitory phenomenon in social evolution have studied the history of civilization to little purpose. The fatalistic view of the recurrence of war is absurd. Common sense and reason ought to find a way to reach agreement in every conflict of honest interests; and there are hopeful signs in the Hague Conference, the laying of the foundations of a periodic Congress of Nations, and of a permanent High Court of Arbitration, which lead us to believe that the glorious day is at hand. But, mark the distinction; honest interests rarely occasion war. Mr. Root has pointed out that by far the greatest cause of war is that suspicion of injustice, threatened and intended, which comes from exasperated feeling. Now, feeling, the feeling which makes one nation willing to go to war with another, makes real causes of difference of no consequence. If the people of two countries want to fight, they will find an excuse—a pretext—find what seems to them sufficient cause in anything. Questions which can be disposed of without the slightest difficulty between countries really friendly, are insoluble between countries really unfriendly. And the feeling between the peoples of different countries is the product of the acts and the words of the peoples of the countries themselves, not of their governments. Insult, contemptuous treatment, bad manners, arrogant and provincial assertion of superiority are the chief causes of war to-day.*

Nevertheless, we are right in affirming that the martial virtues, although originally gained by bitter experience in war, are permanent and valuable possessions of mankind. In order that a nation may endure and maintain its sovereignty, its foundations must be cemented with the martial virtues. It has been truly said that intrepidity, contempt of softness, surrender of private interest, obedience to command, must still remain the rock upon

* Peace Society Address, New York, 1909.

which States are built—unless, indeed, we wish for dangerous reactions against commonwealths fit only for contempt, and liable to invite attack whenever a centre of crystallization for military-minded enterprise gets formed anywhere in their neighborhood. The military ideals of hardihood and discipline should be wrought into the very bone and sinew of the nation.

The man who enlists in the military service, says Mr. H. G. Wells, steps from the street of clamorous insincere advertisement, push, adulteration, underselling and intermittent employment, on to a higher social plane, into an atmosphere of service and co-operation and of infinitely more honorable emulations. Here, at least, a man is supposed to win promotion by self-forgetfulness and not by self-seeking.* And Mr. Wells adds that he thinks that the conceptions of order and discipline, the tradition of service and devotion, of physical fitness, unstinted exertion, and universal responsibility, which universal military duty is now teaching nations, will remain a permanent acquisition, when the last ammunition has been used in the fireworks that celebrate the final peace.

Public sentiment is the power that moulds our institutions and creates our laws; it may lie dormant and hidden for a time in the innermost consciousness of men, but once aroused nothing can withstand it. It is not by clamorous insistency that men accomplish most, but it is the resistless influence, the quiet working of the moral sensibility, which has distinguished peace-loving men and women in all ages, that has removed us from savagery and brutality and set us on the road to peace and brotherhood. The peace enthusiast shudders at the very idea of war and is sometimes so lacking in common sense as to ridicule the notion that armed forces have really accomplished the results he so vainly thought were the products of his own eloquence. The peace enthusiast is impractical; he fails to realize that lofty ideals are not the property of all men. Life is complex; high ideals are the golden threads that form the warp of it; but coarse, crude and oftentimes base materials make up the woof of it.

The idealist would have us believe that the world has gone mad in its demand for Dreadnoughts; but the idealist has just forgotten for the nonce that he is a very small party, and like any other individual he can only sound one trumpet in the grand

* "First and Last Things."

symphony of life. The very men who fight the battles of the idealists and make their dreams possible realities incur the wrath and displeasure of these righteous ones. They flatter themselves that the contests for supremacy have been inconsequential, that right and justice would have triumphed without armed champions, and that no credit whatever is due those who laid down their lives for righteousness' sake. Pushed to its logical conclusion, this prejudice against the use of force in the maintenance of peace would do away with the policeman; but how long do you suppose the gentlefolk of our great cities would continue to live in the enjoyment of their happy homes, were there no uniformed guardians of the peace? And how long do you think peace would reign on earth to-day were there no armies and navies to make aggression and injustice unprofitable and unattractive?

Those who would promote the progress of peace on earth and advance the cause of friendship and good-will among men, those who would give to mankind a broader intellectual horizon and a clearer moral vision, those who would cultivate the graces of life and sweet charity and the love of mankind for one another and spread abroad the Christian influences of enlightenment and civilization are face to face with the problem of self-discipline. It is for each of us in his own sphere to exercise the powers that God has placed in our hands. Let every man do his duty as he sees it, with charity for all and malice towards none, both politically and socially, and by an upright and honorable life give an impulse to that tendency of mankind towards the ideas of civilization and humanity that in the long process of years gradually approaches the supreme idea of Christianity.

WILLIAM H. MONROE.